

REMARKS

The examiner objected to the specification because the same numerals are improperly used to identify different elements. Accordingly, drawings 3-5 have been deleted as they are unnecessary to teach the invention. Drawing 6 has been renumbered as drawing 3. Additionally, drawing 2 and new drawing 3 have been redrawn to properly identify different elements.

Additionally, the examiner indicated that the hydraulic positioning device is inadequately disclosed. Accordingly, the specification has been amended to more properly describe the invention. The examiner also indicated that the abstract should appear without any other recitations: i.e. title, continuing data, inventorship. Accordingly, the abstract has been replaced.


The examiner rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being in narrative form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. Additionally, the examiner found claim 2 to be anticipated by Woodruff et al.

in U.S. patent 2,433,639. However, with regard to claims 1 and 3, the examiner found that the claims 1 and 3 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and, with regard to claim 3, included all the limitations of the base claim.

Claims 1-3 have been canceled. Claim 1 has been rewritten as new claim 4 and claim 3 has been rewritten as new claim 5. Claim 6 is a new claim.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant believes that Claims 4-6 recite allowable subject matter. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph Edward Casterline
4839 E. Rail - N. Road
Tucson, AZ 85739